

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel. W.A. DREW  
EDMONDSON, in his capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA  
SECRETARY OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,  
in his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL  
RESOURCES FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TYSON FOODS, INC.; TYSON POULTRY, INC.; TYSON  
CHICKEN, INC.; COBB-VANTRESS, INC.; AVIAGEN, INC.;  
CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.; CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.;  
CARGILL, INC.; CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC;  
GEORGE'S, INC.; GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.; PETERSON  
FARMS, INC.; SIMMONS FOODS, INC.; and WILLOW  
BROOK FOODS, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 05-CV-0329 JOE-SAJ

---

**ANSWER OF CARGILL INC. TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

---

Defendant Cargill Inc. ("Cargill") responds to the Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint ("Second Amended Complaint" or "Complaint"), filed on July 16, 2007, as follows:

Cargill denies generally and specifically each and every allegation, statement and assertion contained and set forth in the First Amended Complaint, except for those allegations, statements and assertions specifically admitted herein.

Cargill objects to the term "Poultry Integrator Defendants" and denies any express or implied allegations made by use of this term throughout the First Amended Complaint.

Cargill objects to the use of the term "poultry waste" and denies any express or implied allegations made by the use of this term throughout the First Amended Complaint.

Cargill objects to the use of the term “poultry growing operations” and denies any express or implied allegations made by the use of this term throughout the First Amended Complaint.

Cargill objects to the First Amended Complaint on the grounds that no relevant time period is provided. Cargill answers, therefore, based on the current time period. To the extent the First Amended Complaint is construed to encompass a different time period, Cargill specifically denies any liability for such time period.

For reference purposes only, Cargill will refer to the section headings and description of Plaintiffs’ counts and claims. In doing so, Cargill does not admit that these section headings are accurate descriptions of the claims made therein and denies any express or implied allegations contained in the section headings and description of Plaintiffs’ counts and claims.

Cargill specifically denies that any provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. §9601 et seq., the Solid Waste Disposal Act (“SWDA”) 42 U.S.C. §6972, 27A Okla. Stat. §§2-6-105, 2-18.1, and 10-9.7 and Oklahoma Administrative Code §§ 35-17-5-5, 35:17-3-14, are applicable to this action. Cargill specifically denies that Plaintiffs may maintain any cause of action under CERCLA, the SWDA, 27A Okla. Stat. §§2-6-105, 2-18.1, and 10-9.7, Oklahoma Administrative Code §§ 35-17-5-5, 35:17-3-14, state law nuisance, federal common law nuisance, trespass and unjust enrichment/restitution/disgorgement. Cargill specifically denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief requested.

Subject to the foregoing, Cargill answers only on its own behalf and makes no responses on behalf of any other Defendant in this action.

**“I. NATURE OF THE CASE”**

1. Cargill denies the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 1 as to Cargill. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in the first four sentences of paragraph 1 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same. The last sentence in paragraph 1 contains allegations that are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“II. JURISDICTION & VENUE”**

2. The allegations contained in the first two sentences of paragraph 2 are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. The remaining allegations contained in the last two sentences of paragraph 2 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same.

3. Cargill admits that the IRW is situated, in part, in the Northern District of Oklahoma. Cargill denies the remaining allegations of fact contained in paragraph 3 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 3 as they relate to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 3 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

4. Cargill denies the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 4 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of these allegations as they relate to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or

denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 4 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

### **“III. THE PARTIES”**

#### **“A. Plaintiff”**

5. Cargill admits that the State of Oklahoma is a state of the United States. Cargill denies the remaining allegations of fact contained in paragraph 5. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 5 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

#### **“B. Poultry Integrator Defendants”**

6. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 6, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 6 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

7. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 7, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 7 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

8. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 8, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 8 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

9. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 9, and therefore denies same. An

admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 9 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

10. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 10, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 10 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

11. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 11, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 11 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

12. Cargill admits that CTP is a Delaware corporation. Cargill further admits that CTP owns turkeys that are raised on farms located within the IRW for food products and/or breeding and denies the remaining allegations of fact in paragraph 13. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 13 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

13. Cargill admits that it is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Minnesota. Cargill denies the remaining allegations of fact in paragraph 13. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 13 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

14. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 14, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 14 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

15. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 15, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 15 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

16. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 16, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 16 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

17. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 17, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 17 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

18. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 18, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 18 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

19. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 19, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 19 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

20. The allegations in paragraph 20 are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill objects to the term "Poultry Integrator Defendants" and denies all express and implied allegations contained in the designation.

21. The allegations in paragraph 21 are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill answers only on its own behalf and makes no responses on behalf of any other Defendant in this action.

#### **“IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS”**

##### **“A. The Illinois Watershed”**

22. Cargill admits that the IRW is located in both Arkansas and Oklahoma. Cargill further admits that the IRW is located within portions of Delaware, Adair, Cherokee and Sequoyah counties in Oklahoma. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the remaining allegations of fact contained in paragraph 22, and therefore denies same. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the accuracy of Exhibit 1 and, therefore, denies any allegations relating to Exhibit 1.

23. Cargill admits that the Baron (a/k/a Barren) Fork River, the Caney Creek and the Flint Creek are tributaries to the Illinois River. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the remaining allegations of fact contained in paragraph 23, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 23 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

24. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 24, and therefore denies same.

25. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 25, and therefore denies same.

26. Cargill admits that the Illinois River feeds Tenkiller Ferry Lake. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 26, and therefore denies same.

27. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 27, and therefore denies same.

28. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 28, and therefore denies same.

29. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 29, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 29 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

30. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 30, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 30 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

31. Cargill denies the allegations of fact in paragraph 31. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 31 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 31 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“B. The Defendants’ Domination and Control of the Actions and Activities of their Respective Poultry Growers”**

32. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 32 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 32 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.



33. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 33 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 33 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

34. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 34 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 34 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

35. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 35. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 35 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 35 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

36. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 36 and therefore denies same.

37. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 37 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 37 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

38. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 38 as to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 38 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

39. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 39 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same. Cargill denies the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 39 as

to Cargill. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the remaining allegations, and Cargill therefore denies same.

40. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

- a. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40(a). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40(a) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.
- b. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40(b). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40(b) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.
- c. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40(c). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40(c) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.
- d. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40(d). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40(d) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.
- e. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 40(e). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the

truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 40(e) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

41. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 41. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 41 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

42. Cargill denies the allegations as to Cargill in paragraph 42. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 42 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore Cargill denies same.

43. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 43. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 43 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 43 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

44. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 44. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 44 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 44 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

45. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 45 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. Cargill denies the allegations of fact in paragraph 45. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 45 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“C. The Defendants’ Poultry Waste Generation”**

46. Cargill denies the allegations contained in paragraph 46.

47. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 47. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 47 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 47 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“D. The Defendants’ Improper Poultry Waste Disposal Practices and Their Impact”**

48. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 48. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the accuracy of Exhibit 2 and, therefore, denies any allegations relating to Exhibit 2. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 48 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 48 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

49. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 49. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the accuracy of Exhibit 3 and, therefore, denies any allegations relating to Exhibit 3. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 49 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 49 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

:

50. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 50. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 50 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 50 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

51. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 51. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 51 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 51 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

52. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 52. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 52 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 52 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

53. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 53. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 53 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 53 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

54. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 54. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 54 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An

admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 54 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

55. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 55. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 55 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 55 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

56. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 56. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 56 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 56 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

57. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 57. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 57 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 57 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

58. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 58. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

- a. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(a). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations

contained in paragraph 58(a) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

- b. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(b). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(b) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.
- c. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(c). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(c) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.
- d. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(d). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(d) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.
- e. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(e). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(e) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.
- f. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(f). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(f) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

g. Cargill denies the allegations in paragraph 58(g). Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 58(g) with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

59. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 59, and therefore denies same.

60. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 60. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 60 with respect to the other Defendants. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 60 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

61. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 61, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the accuracy of Exhibit 4 and, therefore, denies any allegations relating to Exhibit 4. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 61 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

62. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 62, and Cargill therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 62 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

63. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 63, and Cargill therefore denies same.



64. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 64, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“E. The Reason for this Lawsuit”**

65. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 65, and Cargill therefore denies same.

66. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 66, and Cargill therefore denies same.

67. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations of fact contained in paragraph 67, and Cargill therefore denies same.

68. Cargill denies the allegations of fact contained in Paragraph 68. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 68 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 68 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

69. Cargill denies the allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 69. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 69 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. An admission or denial is not required for allegations contained in paragraph 69 that call for a legal conclusion, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“IV. CAUSES OF ACTION”**

**“A. Count 1: CERCLA Cost Recovery – 42 U.S.C. § 9607”**

70. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 69.

71. The allegations contained in paragraph 71 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 71. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 71 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

72. Cargill objects to the allegations in paragraph 72 on vagueness grounds. To the extent an answer is required, Cargill states that the allegations contained in paragraph 72 that call for a legal conclusion do not require an admission or a denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill further denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 72. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 72 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

73. The allegations contained in paragraph 73 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 73. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 73 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

74. The allegations contained in paragraph 74 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 74. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 74 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

75. The allegations contained in paragraph 75 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any

allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 75. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 75 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

76. The allegations contained in paragraph 76 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 76. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 76 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

77. The allegations contained in paragraph 77 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial are not required, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“B. Count 2: CERCLA Natural Resource Damages – 42 U.S.C. § 9607”**

78. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 77.

79. The allegations contained in paragraph 79 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial are not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 79.

80. The allegations contained in paragraph 80 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 80. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 80 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

81. Cargill objects to the allegations in paragraph 81 on vagueness grounds. To the extent an answer is required, Cargill states that the allegations contained in paragraph 81 that call

for a legal conclusion do not require an admission or a denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill further denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 81. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 81 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

82. The allegations contained in paragraph 82 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 82. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 82 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

83. The allegations contained in paragraph 83 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 83. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 83 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

84. The allegations contained in paragraph 84 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 84. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 84 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

85. The allegations contained in paragraph 85 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 85. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 85 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

86. The allegations contained in paragraph 86 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 86.

87. The allegations contained in paragraph 87 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 87. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 87 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

88. The allegations contained in paragraph 88 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 88.

89. The allegations contained in paragraph 89 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 89. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 83 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“C. Count 3: SWDA Citizen Suit”**

90. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 89.

91. Cargill admits that Exhibit 5, Notice of Intent to File Citizen Suit Pursuant to the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. §6972(a)(1)(B), speaks for itself and denies any allegations

in paragraph 91 to the contrary. Cargill denies any allegations contained in Exhibit 5. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 91 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same. The remaining allegations contained in paragraph 91 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same.

92. The allegations contained in paragraph 92 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 92.

93. The allegations contained in paragraph 93 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 93. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 93 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

94. The allegations contained in paragraph 94 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 94. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 94 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

95. The allegations contained in paragraph 95 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 95. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 95 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

96. The allegations contained in paragraph 96 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 96. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 96 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

97. The allegations contained in paragraph 97 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 97.

**“D. Count 4: State Law Nuisance”**

98. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 97.

99. The allegations contained in paragraph 99 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 99. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 99 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

100. The allegations contained in paragraph 100 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 100. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 100 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

101. The allegations contained in paragraph 101 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 101.

102. The allegations contained in paragraph 102 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 102. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 102 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

103. The allegations contained in paragraph 103 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 103. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 103 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

104. The allegations contained in paragraph 104 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 104. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 104 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

105. The allegations contained in paragraph 105 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 105. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 105 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.



106. The allegations contained in paragraph 106 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 106. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 106 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

107. The allegations contained in paragraph 107 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 107. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 107 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

108. The allegations contained in paragraph 108 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“E. Count 5: Federal Common Law Nuisance”**

109. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 108.

110. The allegations contained in paragraph 110 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 110. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 110 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

111. The allegations contained in paragraph 111 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 111. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 111 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

112. The allegations contained in paragraph 112 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 112. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 112 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

113. The allegations contained in paragraph 113 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 113. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 113 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

114. The allegations contained in paragraph 114 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact in paragraph 114.

115. The allegations contained in paragraph 115 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 115. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 115 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

116. The allegations contained in paragraph 116 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 116. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 116 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

117. The allegations contained in paragraph 117 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 117. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 117 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

118. The allegations contained in paragraph 118 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 118. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 118 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“F. Count 6: Trespass”**

119. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 118.

120. The allegations contained in paragraph 120 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 120. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 120 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

121. The allegations contained in paragraph 121 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 121. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 121 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

122. The allegations contained in paragraph 122 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 122. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 122 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

123. The allegations contained in paragraph 123 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as in paragraph 123.

124. The allegations contained in paragraph 124 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 124. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 124 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

125. The allegations contained in paragraph 125 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 125. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 125 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

126. The allegations contained in paragraph 126 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 126. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 126 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

127. The allegations contained in paragraph 127 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**“Count 7: Violation of 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-105 & 2 Okla. Stat. § 2-18.1”**

128. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 127.

129. The allegations contained in paragraph 129 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 129. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 129 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

130. The allegations contained in paragraph 130 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 130. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 130 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

131. The allegations contained in paragraph 131 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 131. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 131 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

132. The allegations contained in paragraph 132 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 132. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 132 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“H. Count 8: Violation of 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7 and Oklahoma Administrative Code § 35:17-5-5”**

133. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 132.

134. The allegations contained in paragraph 134 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 134. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 134 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

135. The allegations contained in paragraph 135 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 135. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 135 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

136. The allegations contained in paragraph 136 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 136. Cargill is without knowledge or information

sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 136 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“I. Count 9: Violation of Oklahoma Administrative Code, § 35:17-3-14”**

137. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and their answers to paragraphs 1 through 136.

138. The allegations contained in paragraph 138 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 138. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 138 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

139. The allegations contained in paragraph 139 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 139. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 139 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

**“J. Count 10: Unjust Enrichment/Restitution/Disgorgement”**

140. Cargill incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, all objections to the First Amended Complaint and its answers to paragraphs 1 through 139.

141. The allegations contained in paragraph 141 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 141. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 141 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

142. The allegations contained in paragraph 142 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 142. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 142 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

143. The allegations contained in paragraph 143 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 143. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 143 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

144. The allegations contained in paragraph 144 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 144. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 144 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

145. The allegations contained in paragraph 145 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 145. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 145 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

146. The allegations contained in paragraph 146 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 146. Cargill is without knowledge or information



sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 146 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

147. The allegations contained in paragraph 147 call for a legal conclusion, for which an admission or denial is not required, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill denies any allegations of fact as to Cargill in paragraph 147. Cargill is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 147 with respect to the other Defendants, and therefore denies same.

---

**“VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF”**

The allegations contained in Section VI are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same. Cargill specifically denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief.

**“VII. JURY DEMAND”**

The allegations contained in Section VII are not averments of fact that require admission or denial, and Cargill therefore denies same.

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Cargill alleges that:

1. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and must be dismissed.
2. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the applicable statutes of limitation.
3. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of laches, estoppel, and waiver.
4. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.
5. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of license and consent.

;

6. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.
7. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of abstention.
8. Plaintiffs lack standing to bring this action.
9. Plaintiffs have failed to join indispensable parties.
10. Plaintiffs have not joined the party/parties at fault for Plaintiffs' alleged injuries. Cargill reserves its right at trial to seek an allocation of fault to, and contribution from, such party/parties.
11. The Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over some or all of the claims alleged in the Complaint.
12. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, because the activities that are the basis of Plaintiffs' claims are authorized by state statute, including OKLA.STAT. tit. 50 § 4, OKLA.STAT. tit. 50 § 1.1(d), OKLA.STAT. tit. 2 § 10-9.1 et seq., OKLA.STAT. tit. 2 § 9-200 et seq., ARKANSAS CODE ANNOTATED § 2-4-101.
13. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the applicable statutes of repose.
14. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrine of contributory and/or comparative negligence. In the alternative, Plaintiffs' claims for damages must be reduced by the doctrine of comparative negligence.
15. Plaintiffs' claims are subject to either the exclusive or the primary jurisdiction of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality, the Arkansas Department of Health, the Arkansas Forestry Commission, and/or the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation.

16. Plaintiffs' claims are barred until the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality and other state agencies establish Total Maximum Daily Loads, as required by the Clean Water Act, for each of the alleged pollutants at issue in the First Amended Complaint.
17. Plaintiffs' claims are barred to the extent they rely on the retroactive application of statutes, rules, regulations or common-law standards of conduct, as that reliance would violate the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Oklahoma.
18. Plaintiffs' improperly seek to impose Oklahoma statutes and common law upon practices occurring outside the borders of Oklahoma in violation of the due process clause under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution the Dormant Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, and the federalism and comity principles inherent in the United States Constitution.
19. Plaintiffs' claims improperly violate the sovereignty of Arkansas.
20. Plaintiffs' claims violate Cargill's constitutional rights of due process and equal protection under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and under analogous state constitutional provisions.
21. Some or all of Plaintiffs' claims are not amenable to judicial resolution because they present a political question.
22. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because the statutory or regulatory provisions upon which they are based are unconstitutionally void for vagueness or otherwise violate due process.

23. Plaintiffs' state law claims are preempted in whole or in part by CERCLA, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq. (a.k.a, Clean Water Act), the Packers and Stockyards Act, 7, U.S.C. § 181 et seq., and/or other federal statutes.
24. Plaintiffs' claims are preempted by the Arkansas River Basin Compact, OKLA.STAT. tit. 82.
25. The Northern District of Oklahoma is not a proper venue for Plaintiffs' claims.
26. Plaintiffs do not have a right to a jury trial.
27. Any liability that Cargill may bear in connection with the events described in the Complaint, which liability it specifically denies, is several only and not joint.
28. Any liability that Cargill may bear in connection with the events described in the Complaint, which liability it specifically denies, is liability for contribution only.
29. Plaintiffs' cannot assert a claim for equitable relief because they failed to join all potentially responsible parties.
30. Plaintiffs fail to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Cargill for which punitive or exemplary damages may be granted and, any award of punitive damages against Cargill would be unconstitutional.

31. Plaintiffs seek damages and attorneys' fees and costs that are not recoverable as a matter of law and fact, including, without limitation contingency fees and attorneys' litigation fees under CERCLA.
32. Plaintiffs seek damages that exceed statutory liability caps or are otherwise excessive.
33. To the extent plaintiffs' Complaint asserts claims for equitable relief, such claims are barred to the extent that plaintiffs have an adequate remedy at law.
34. Any damages plaintiffs may have suffered, which damages are specifically denied, are divisible and segregable, both in cause and in effect.
35. Plaintiffs have failed to mitigate damages, if any.
36. Plaintiffs' damages, if any, result in whole or part from their own acts, errors, omissions, or negligence or that of third parties over whom Cargill has no control.
37. Plaintiffs' damages, if any, were proximately caused by an unforeseeable, independent, supervening, intervening and/or superseding event beyond the control and unrelated to any conduct of Cargill. Cargill's actions, if any, were superseded by the negligence and wrongful conduct of others.
38. Plaintiffs assumed the risk relative to damages, if any.
39. Some or all of Plaintiffs are not the real parties in interest as to some or all of the claims and damages alleged in the Complaint.
40. Plaintiffs' claims for relief are barred because Plaintiffs injuries, if any, were caused by acts, conditions, and circumstances of an indeterminate or unknown character or nature and, therefore, it is impossible to determine facts as to time, place, product, and causal relation.

41. Cargill has neither the ability nor authority to control or affect the timing, manner, and location of the application of poultry litter.
42. To the extent that any “growers” are agents or employees of Cargill, which agency and employee status is specifically denied, some or all of the acts complained of in the Complaint were and are outside the scope of any such agency and employment, and Cargill therefore is not liable.
43. Cargill acted in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, permits, and industry standards at all applicable times.
44. Cargill’s conduct is not the direct or proximate cause of any damages alleged to have been suffered by Plaintiffs.
45. The conduct and conditions alleged by Plaintiffs do not constitute a recurring or permanent nuisance.
46. Cargill has not been unjustly enriched by any conduct alleged by Plaintiffs.
47. Any response costs incurred by Plaintiffs, which Cargill specifically denies were incurred, were inconsistent with the National Contingency Plan.
48. Plaintiffs CERCLA claims are barred by the Plaintiffs’ status as potentially responsible parties.
49. To the extent Plaintiffs’ Complaint asserts CERCLA claims on the grounds that there are or have been releases, which Cargill specifically denies, such claims are barred by the exception under CERCLA to the definition of a release for the normal application of fertilizer, 42 U.S.C. §9601(22).
50. To the extent Plaintiffs’ Complaint asserts CERCLA claims on the grounds that there are or have been releases, which Cargill specifically denies, such claims are

barred by the exception under CERCLA to the definition of a release for federally permitted releases, 42 U.S.C. §9601(10).

51. To the extent Plaintiffs' Complaint asserts CERCLA claims on the grounds that there are or have been releases, any such releases, which Cargill specifically denies, would be de minimis releases.
52. Plaintiff's SWDA claim is barred for failure to comply with the requirements under 42 U.S.C. § 6972(b)(2).
53. Plaintiffs' are not entitled to recover past costs under the SWDA.
54. Plaintiffs' SWDA claims are barred because the poultry litter at issue is used as an effective substitute for commercial fertilizer and, therefore, is not a solid waste, 40 C.F.R. §261.2 (e).
55. Plaintiffs' SWDA claims are barred because agricultural wastes which are returned to the soil a fertilizers or soil conditioners are not discarded materials, and, therefore are not solid wastes.
56. Plaintiffs' SWDA claims are barred because wastes generated by the raising of animals, incuding animal manures, which are returned to the soils as fertilizers are not hazardous wastes pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 261.4(b)(2)(ii).
57. Plaintiffs' SWDA claims are barred because Plaintiffs lack standing to bring a citizen suit under the SWDA.
58. Plaintiffs SWDA and CERCLA claims are barred by exemptions and exclusions contained within those statutes.

!

59. Plaintiffs' state common law nuisance claim is invalid on its face and must fail due to the existence of state statutes directly governing and authorizing the conduct that is the basis of Plaintiffs' state common law nuisance claim (Count 4).
60. Plaintiffs' state common law trespass claim is invalid on its face and must fail due to the existence of state statutes directly governing and authorizing the conduct that is the basis of Plaintiffs' state common law trespass claim (Count 6).
61. Plaintiffs' unjust enrichment claim is invalid on its face and must fail due to the existence of state statutes directly governing and authorizing the conduct that is the basis of Plaintiffs' unjust enrichment claim (Count 10).
62. Plaintiffs have failed to exhaust available administrative remedies for alleged violations of the Oklahoma Agricultural Code (Count 7).
63. Plaintiffs have failed to exhaust administrative remedies for alleged violations of the Oklahoma Registered Poultry Feeding Operations Act (Count 8).
64. Plaintiffs have failed to exhaust administrative remedies for alleged violations of the Oklahoma Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Act (Count 9).
65. State agencies, including Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, and Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission, have been entrusted with the responsibility of regulating the practices and conduct that is the basis of Plaintiffs' claims of nuisance (Count 4), trespass (Count 6), violations of the Oklahoma Agricultural Code (Count 7), violations of the Oklahoma Registered Poultry Feeding Operations Act (Count 8), violations of the Oklahoma Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations Act (Count 9), and unjust enrichment



(Count 10), and accordingly this Court must exercise judicial abstention under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction.

66. Cargill adopts and incorporates by reference all affirmative defenses presently or subsequently asserted by any of their co-defendants.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

The above stated affirmative defenses are based on the knowledge and information currently possessed by Cargill. Cargill reserves the right to assert any additional defenses that it may discover throughout the course of this case. Cargill further reserves the right to amend its answers or otherwise plead in response to Plaintiff's Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Cargill Inc., having answered the allegations of the First Amended Complaint, prays that the Court:

- (a) enter judgment in its favor and against Plaintiffs on all claims alleged against it by Plaintiffs;
- (b) dismiss this case with prejudice;
- (c) award Cargill Inc. its costs and expenses, including expert witness fees, incurred in connection with defending this case;
- (d) award Cargill Inc. its reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in connection with defending this case;
- (e) award Cargill Inc. prejudgment and post-judgment interest, as applicable, on all costs and fees incurred in connection with this case; and
- (f) award Cargill Inc. such other further relief as the Court may deem just and equitable under the circumstances.

;

Respectfully submitted,

s/ John H. Tucker

JOHN H. TUCKER, OBA #9110  
COLIN H. TUCKER, OBA #16325  
THERESA NOBLE HILL, OBA #19119  
100 W. Fifth Street, Suite 400 (74103-4287)  
P.O. Box 21100  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100  
Telephone: 918/582-1173  
Facsimile: 918/592-3390

And

DELMAR R. EHRICH  
BRUCE JONES  
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP  
2200 Wells Fargo Center  
90 South Seventh Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
Telephone: 612/766-7000  
Facsimile: 612/766-1600

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT CARGILL, INC.

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the 15th day of August, 2007, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

|                                                |                                                                                          |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General         | <a href="mailto:drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us">drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us</a>       |
| Kelly Hunter Burch, Assistant Attorney General | <a href="mailto:kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us">kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us</a>             |
| J. Trevor Hammons, Assistant Attorney General  | <a href="mailto:trevor_hammons@oag.state.ok.us">trevor_hammons@oag.state.ok.us</a>       |
| Robert D. Singletary                           | <a href="mailto:Robert_singletary@oag.state.ok.us">Robert_singletary@oag.state.ok.us</a> |
| Daniel Lennington, Assistant Attorney General  | <a href="mailto:Daniel.lennington@oag.ok.gov">Daniel.lennington@oag.ok.gov</a>           |

|                                         |                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Douglas Allen Wilson                    | <a href="mailto:doug_wilson@riggsabney.com">doug_wilson@riggsabney.com</a> |
| Melvin David Riggs                      | <a href="mailto:driggs@riggsabney.com">driggs@riggsabney.com</a>           |
| Richard T. Garren                       | <a href="mailto:rgarren@riggsabney.com">rgarren@riggsabney.com</a>         |
| Sharon K. Weaver                        | <a href="mailto:sweaver@riggsabney.com">sweaver@riggsabney.com</a>         |
| Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis |                                                                            |

|                       |                                                                    |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Robert Allen Nance    | <a href="mailto:rnance@riggsabney.com">rnance@riggsabney.com</a>   |
| Dorothy Sharon Gentry | <a href="mailto:sgentry@riggsabney.com">sgentry@riggsabney.com</a> |
| Riggs Abney           |                                                                    |

J. Randall Miller  
David P. Page  
Louis W. Bullock  
Miller Keffer & Bullock

[rmiller@mkblaw.net](mailto:rmiller@mkblaw.net)  
[dpage@mkblaw.net](mailto:dpage@mkblaw.net)  
[lbullock@mkblaw.net](mailto:lbullock@mkblaw.net)

William H. Narwold  
Elizabeth C. Ward  
Frederick C. Baker  
Lee M. Heath  
Elizabeth Claire Xidis  
Motley Rice

[bnarwold@motleyrice.com](mailto:bnarwold@motleyrice.com)  
[lward@motleyrice.com](mailto:lward@motleyrice.com)  
[fbaker@motleyrice.com](mailto:fbaker@motleyrice.com)  
[lheath@motleyrice.com](mailto:lheath@motleyrice.com)  
[cxidis@motleyrice.com](mailto:cxidis@motleyrice.com)

**COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS**

Stephen L. Jantzen  
Paula M. Buchwald  
Ryan, Whaley & Coldiron, P.C.

[sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com](mailto:sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com)  
[pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com](mailto:pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com)

Mark D. Hopson  
Jay Thomas Jorgensen  
Timothy K. Webster  
Sidley Austin LLP

[mhopson@sidley.com](mailto:mhopson@sidley.com)  
[jjorgensen@sidley.com](mailto:jjorgensen@sidley.com)  
[twebster@sidley.com](mailto:twebster@sidley.com)

Robert W. George  
Michael R. Bond  
Erin W. Thompson  
LLP

[robert.george@kutakrock.com](mailto:robert.george@kutakrock.com)  
[michael.bond@kutakrock.com](mailto:michael.bond@kutakrock.com)  
[erin.thompson@kutakrock.com](mailto:erin.thompson@kutakrock.com) Kutack Rock

**COUNSEL FOR TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY, INC., TYSON CHICKEN, INC.;  
AND COBB-VANTRESS, INC.**

R. Thomas Lay  
Kerr, Irvine, Rhodes & Ables

[rtl@kiralaw.com](mailto:rtl@kiralaw.com)

Jennifer S. Griffin  
Lathrop & Gage, L.C.  
**COUNSEL FOR WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.**

[jgriffin@lathropgage.com](mailto:jgriffin@lathropgage.com)

Robert P. Redemann  
Lawrence W. Zeringue  
David C. Senger  
Perrine, McGivern, Redemann, Reid, Berry & Taylor, PLLC

[rredemann@pmrlaw.net](mailto:rredemann@pmrlaw.net)  
[lzingue@pmrlaw.net](mailto:lzingue@pmrlaw.net)  
[dsenger@pmrlaw.net](mailto:dsenger@pmrlaw.net)

Robert E. Sanders  
E. Stephen Williams  
Young Williams P.A.

[rsanders@youngwilliams.com](mailto:rsanders@youngwilliams.com)  
[steve.williams@youngwilliams.com](mailto:steve.williams@youngwilliams.com)

**COUNSEL FOR CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC. AND CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.**

George W. Owens  
Randall E. Rose  
The Owens Law Firm, P.C.

[gwo@owenslawfirmnpc.com](mailto:gwo@owenslawfirmnpc.com)  
[rer@owenslawfirmnpc.com](mailto:rer@owenslawfirmnpc.com)

James M. Graves

[jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com](mailto:jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com)

Gary V. Weeks  
Bassett Law Firm  
**COUNSEL FOR GEORGE'S INC. AND GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.**

John R. Elrod  
Vicki Bronson  
Bruce W. Freeman  
Conner & Winters, LLLP  
**COUNSEL FOR SIMMONS FOODS, INC.**

[jelrod@cwlaw.com](mailto:jelrod@cwlaw.com)  
[vbronson@cwlaw.com](mailto:vbronson@cwlaw.com)  
[bfreeman@cwlaw.com](mailto:bfreeman@cwlaw.com)

A. Scott McDaniel  
Nicole M. Longwell  
Philip D. Hixon  
McDaniel, Hixon, Longwell & Acord, PLLC  
Sherry P. Bartley  
Mitchell Williams Selig Gates & Woodyard  
**COUNSEL FOR PETERSON FARMS, INC.**

[smcdaniel@mhla-law.com](mailto:smcdaniel@mhla-law.com)  
[nlongwell@mhla-law.com](mailto:nlongwell@mhla-law.com)  
[phixon@mhla-law.com](mailto:phixon@mhla-law.com)  
[sbartley@mwsgw.com](mailto:sbartley@mwsgw.com)

Michael D. Graves  
Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr.  
**COUNSEL FOR CERTAIN POULTRY GROWERS**

[mgraves@hallestill.com](mailto:mgraves@hallestill.com)  
[kwilliams@hallestill.com](mailto:kwilliams@hallestill.com)

I also hereby certify that I served the attached documents by United States Postal Service, proper postage paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

C. Miles Tolbert  
Secretary of the Environment  
State of Oklahoma  
3800 North Classen  
Oklahoma City, OK 73118  
**COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS**

Charles L. Moulton  
Arkansas Natural Resources Commission  
323 Center Street  
Suite 200  
Little Rock, AR 72206

s/ John H. Tucker